

Table 6-1. Ranking of Remedial Technologies by Green Core Elements

		Remedial Technologies															
				In-Place Technologies							Transport and Dispo			osal of Dredge Material			
Green Remediation Core Elements	Sub-elements		ed Natural ry (MNR)	Enhanced Monitored Natural Recovery (EMNR)		In-situ Treatment		Engineered Cap		Dredging		Upland Disposal		Confined Disposal Facility/Confined Aquatic Disposal		Removal and Installation of Piling an Structures	
Total Energy and Renewable Energy Use	Energy Use	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•
	Renewable Energy Use	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•
Air Pollutants and GHG Emissions	Air Pollutants and GHG Emissions	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•
Water Use and Impacts to Water	Water Use	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•
Resources	Protection of Water Resources	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•
Waste	Materials Management and Waste Reduction	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•
Land and	Land Management/ Restoration	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•
Ecosystems	Ecosystem Protection	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•	•	/•

Note:

¹ The rationale for rankings focuses on implementation of the remedy. Green remediation opportunities during the Site assessment and planning and design stages are similar for all alternatives. In addition to specifc smaller scale administrative and Site investigation best management practices (BMPs), steps to ensure green remediation opportunities are maximized include collecting data to evaluate green remediation opportunities and developing plans to integrate renewable energy, water use reduction and protection, land protection and waste reduction into the cleanup action.

25.11 s), steps to ensure green remediation opportunities are maxi-											
LEGEND		Score									
Remedial Technology Ranking											
(Highly Green = Low Environmental Footprint)											
Highly Green	1										
Moderately Green	•	0									
Minimally Green	•	-1									
Green Remediation Opportunity Ranking (Large Green Oppportunity = Potentially large environmental footprint reduction)											
Small Green Opportunity	/•	-1									
Medium Green Opportunity	/•	0									
Large Green Opportunity	/•	1									



Table 7-1. Areas and Volumes of Each Alternative

		Remedial Technologies													
			Percent of To	otal Site Area	1 -	Percent by	Disposal Percent Normalized by Greatest Disposal Volume (Alt F-r)								
Alternative	Dredge	Engineered Cap & CAD/CDF	In Situ Treatment	EMNR	MNR	Total	% to CAD/CDF	% to Upland	% to CAD/CDF	% to Upland					
B-i	1.1%	0.3%	0.9%	3.5%	94.3%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	4.7%					
B-r	1.9%	1.9%	0.0%	1.9%	94.3%	100.0%	35.8%	64.2%	4.5%	8.1%					
C-i	1.6%	2.1%	1.3%	1.8%	93.1%	100.0%	61.0%	39.0%	4.5%	2.9%					
C-r	2.9%	0.6%	0.0%	3.4%	93.1%	100.0%	82.1%	17.9%	15.0%	3.3%					
D-i	2.0%	2.2%	1.6%	1.7%	92.5%	100.0%	49.6%	50.4%	4.5%	4.6%					
D-r	3.6%	0.7%	0.0%	3.1%	92.5%	100.0%	70.0%	30.0%	15.0%	6.4%					
E-i	4.2%	3.3%	2.7%	0.7%	89.1%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	22.0%	0.0%					
E-r	6.7%	3.5%	0.0%	0.7%	89.1%	100.0%	92.2%	7.8%	38.7%	3.3%					
F-i	8.1%	5.0%	5.4%	0.2%	81.3%	100.0%	75.9%	24.1%	38.7%	12.3%					
F-r	14.0%	4.5%	0.0%	0.2%	81.3%	100.0%	38.7%	61.3%	38.7%	61.3%					

Draft Feasibility Study March 30, 2012



Table 7-2. Environmental Footprint Ranking by Alternative ¹

		Lowest										
	Percent of Total Site Area Disposal Percent by Volume									Overall Total	Footprint Ranking	
Alternative	Dredge	Engineered Cap & CAD/CDF	In Situ Treatment	EMNR	MNR		% to CAD/CDF	% to Upland				
Footprint Score (higher the score, lower the footprint)	-7	-5	-2	0	4	Area Score	-5	-7	Volume Score	Highest total score = Lowest footprint	1 = lowest footprint	
B-i	-0.07	-0.02	-0.02	0.00	3.77	3.66	0.00	-0.33	-0.33	3.33	1	
B-r	-0.14	-0.09	0.00	0.00	3.77	3.54	-0.23	-0.57	-0.80	2.74	4	
C-i	-0.11	-0.11	-0.03	0.00	3.72	3.48	-0.23	-0.20	-0.43	3.05	2	
C-r	-0.20	-0.03	0.00	0.00	3.72	3.49	-0.75	-0.23	-0.98	2.51	5	
D-i	-0.14	-0.11	-0.03	0.00	3.70	3.42	-0.23	-0.32	-0.55	2.87	3	
D-r	-0.25	-0.04	0.00	0.00	3.70	3.41	-0.75	-0.45	-1.20	2.21	6	
E-i	-0.29	-0.17	-0.05	0.00	3.56	3.05	-1.10	0.00	-1.10	1.95	7	
E-r	-0.47	-0.17	0.00	0.00	3.56	2.92	-1.94	-0.23	-2.17	0.76	8	
F-i	-0.57	-0.25	-0.11	0.00	3.25	2.33	-1.94	-0.86	-2.79	-0.47	9	
F-r	-0.98	-0.23	0.00	0.00	3.25	2.05	-1.94	-4.29	-6.23	-4.18	10	

¹ Qualitative assessment of environmental footprint based on ranking of remedial technologies (Table 6-1) multiplied by areas and volumes of these technologies (Table 7-1)

Draft Feasibility Study March 30, 2012



Table 7-3. Green Remediation Opportunity Ranking by Alternative ²

		Highest Opportunity									
			Volume	Overall Total	Ranking						
Alternative	Dredge	Engineered Cap & CAD/CDF	In Situ Treatment	EMNR	MNR		% to CAD/CDF	% to Upland			
Green Remediation Opportunity Score (higher the score, higher the opportunity)	0	1	-8	-4	-6	Area Score	-5	0	Volume Score	Highest total score = Highest opportunity	1 = Highest Opportunity
B-i	0.00	0.00	-0.07	-0.14	-5.66	-5.86	-5.00	-4.76	-9.76	-15.63	10
B-r	0.00	0.02	0.00	-0.08	-5.66	-5.71	-4.77	-4.59	-9.37	-15.08	7
C-i	0.00	0.02	-0.11	-0.07	-5.59	-5.75	-4.77	-4.86	-9.63	-15.37	9
C-r	0.00	0.01	0.00	-0.13	-5.59	-5.72	-4.25	-4.84	-9.09	-14.80	6
D-i	0.00	0.02	-0.13	-0.07	-5.55	-5.72	-4.77	-4.77	-9.54	-15.27	8
D-r	0.00	0.01	0.00	-0.12	-5.55	-5.67	-4.25	-4.68	-8.93	-14.60	5
E-i	0.00	0.03	-0.21	-0.03	-5.35	-5.55	-3.90	-5.00	-8.90	-14.45	4
E-r	0.00	0.03	0.00	-0.03	-5.35	-5.34	-3.06	-4.84	-7.90	-13.24	3
F-i	0.00	0.05	-0.43	-0.01	-4.88	-5.27	-3.06	-4.39	-7.45	-12.72	2
F-r	0.00	0.05	0.00	-0.01	-4.88	-4.84	-3.06	-1.94	-5.00	-9.84	1

² Qualitative assessment of green remediation opportunity ranking based on ranking of remedial technologies (Table 6-1) multiplied by areas and volumes of these technologies (Table 7-1)

March 30, 2012



Table 7-4. Combined Environmental Footprint and Green Remediation Opportunities Ranking by Alternative

		ar r ootprint t	and Green Ke			0 1	7 HITCH HULLI V C			I a	ı				
	Remedial Technologies									Overall Total:		Overall Total:		Overall Total:	
1									assumes 100% of		assumes 50% of		assumes 25% of		
	ı									green		green		green	
	ı						Disposal Per	cent normalize	ed by greatest	opportunities are	Combined	opportunities are	Combined	opportunities	Combined
Alternative	ı		Percent of To	tal Site Area			dispo	sal volume (A	lt F-r)	applied	Ranking	applied	Ranking	are applied	Ranking
										Highest total		Highest total		Highest total	
ĺ	ı									score = Most		score = Most		score = Most	
ĺ	ı								Total	green (lowest	1 = Highest	green (lowest	1 = Highest	green (lowest	
ĺ	ı	Engineered							(Compared	footprint +	combined score	,	combined score	footprint +	1 = Highest
Green Remediation	ı	Cap &	In Situ				% to		to highest	Highest green	/ Smallest	Highest green	/ Smallest	Highest green	combined score /
Opportunity Score	Dredge	CAD/CDF	Treatment	EMNR	MNR	Total	1	 % to Upland	_	opportunity)	footprint	opportunity)	footprint	opportunity)	Smallest footprint
Opportunity Score									, i	11 07	1001111111	opportunity)	тоогринг	opportunity)	Smallest 100tp1111t
B-i	1.1%	0.3%	0.9%	3.5%	94.3%	100.0%	0.0%	4.7%	4.7%	-12.29	2	-4.48	1	-0.58	1
B-r	1.9%	1.9%	0.0%	1.9%	94.3%	100.0%	4.5%	8.1%	12.7%	-12.34	4	-4.80	4	-1.03	4
C-i	1.6%	2.1%	1.3%	1.8%	93.1%	100.0%	4.5%	2.9%	7.4%	-12.32	3	-4.64	2	-0.79	2
C-r	2.9%	0.6%	0.0%	3.4%	93.1%	100.0%	15.0%	3.3%	18.2%	-12.29	1	-4.89	5	-1.19	5
D-i	2.0%	2.2%	1.6%	1.7%	92.5%	100.0%	4.5%	4.6%	9.1%	-12.40	6	-4.76	3	-0.95	3
D-r	3.6%	0.7%	0.0%	3.1%	92.5%	100.0%	15.0%	6.4%	21.4%	-12.39	5	-5.09	6	-1.44	6
E-i	4.2%	3.3%	2.7%	0.7%	89.1%	100.0%	22.0%	0.0%	22.0%	-12.50	8	-5.28	7	-1.66	7
E-r	6.7%	3.5%	0.0%	0.7%	89.1%	100.0%	38.7%	3.3%	42.0%	-12.48	7	-5.86	8	-2.55	8
F-i	8.1%	5.0%	5.4%	0.2%	81.3%	100.0%	38.7%	12.3%	51.0%	-13.19	9	-6.83	9	-3.65	9
F-r	14.0%	4.5%	0.0%	0.2%	81.3%	100.0%	38.7%	61.3%	100.0%	-14.02	10	-9.10	10	-6.64	10